



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Kurt C. Gish, et al.

Application Serial No. 09/930,020

Filed: August 14, 2001

For: METHODS OF DIAGNOSIS OF COLORECTAL CANCER, COMPOSITIONS, AND METHODS OF SCREENING FOR COLORECTAL CANCER MODULATORS Art Unit: 1642

Examiner: Rawlings, Stephen L.

Confirmation No.: 2304

Attorney's Docket No:

05882.00168.CPUS01

RECEIVED

AUG 2 9 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

RESPONSE TO OFFICE COMMUNICATION

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This in response to the Office Communication dated June 25, 2003, and is submitted on or before the extended due date of **August 25, 2003**. A petition for a one-month extension of time and the requisite fee is enclosed.

<u>REMARKS</u>

In the Office Communication, the Examiner states that Applicants' reply filed on April 11, 2003 is not fully responsive because Applicants have not elected one gene set forth in Table 1 and/or Table 2. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's statements are incorrect.

In Applicants' Response dated April 11, 2003, Applicants have elected Claim 7 for examination. Applicants have further canceled Claim 7 and re-written it as new Claim 32. New Claim 32 does not recite a nucleic acid of Table 1 or 2. New Claim 32 only recites a gene of SEQ ID NO: 1.